

# U.S. PROBATION



**Annual Report  
Fiscal Year 2000**

## **A YEAR OF PERFORMANCE UNDER PRESSURE**

As fiscal year 2000 began, the Probation Office in Arizona was the most understaffed office nationally at 67.44% of formula when the national standard was 84%. The understaffing occurred as a direct consequence of Congressionally funded increased law enforcement activities by the Department of Justice along the international border with Mexico. Because the national allocation of staff to the 93 district probation offices occurs at the end of the fiscal year, the enormous growth in workload during the year in combination with the Administrative Office's inability to fully allocate positions the previous year, resulted in a need for 39.97 new positions at the beginning of the year. Because of a shortfall in funding at the national level, all offices were required to appeal for new positions. During the appeal process, the Probation Office continued to function at 67.44% of formula, crippling operations. Staff working conditions were desperate.

The majority of officers and many support staff consistently worked more than 40 hours per week in order to meet demands of the workload. Compensatory time was the only compensation available, but in most cases, the continued demands of the workload did not allow officers to use the compensatory time they accrued. Lapse funds were used to bring temporary duty probation officers from other districts to temporarily create more staff in Arizona to do the work. "Fast-track" presentence reports with reduced content requirements in certain social history areas were used for most felony illegal reentry cases. Officers assigned exclusively to supervision took on overflow presentence report assignments in order to meet the workload. Such

assignments reduced the amount of time they devoted to case management and undermined their ability to work effectively in the community.

Finally in January 2000, at the end of the first quarter, the Probation Office was allocated 26 of the necessary 39.97 new positions. The 26 new positions would bring operations to 79%, not ideal, but an opportunity to substantially improve manpower. The hiring process began at all levels of the organization, necessitating recruitment of officers, officer assistants, and support staff. The increase in staff also provided opportunities for promotion since more managers were necessary. By the end of the fiscal year, the 26 new positions provided some relief to the staff of the Probation Office. Their work during fiscal year 2000 was exceptional — they consistently worked above national expectations throughout the year and through dedicated effort were able to meet the workload demands.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

When the fiscal year began, the staffing allocation was 154.6 positions. With the additional 26 positions allocated in January, the allocation increased to 180.6. The following staffing charts describe the organization of staff in September 2000, the end of the fiscal year.

## OFFICER/MANAGER STAFFING

LOCATION	CUSPO	DCUSPO	ADCUSPO	SUSPO	SPEC	USPO	USPOA
TUCSON	1			9	9	39	4
PHOENIX		1	1	7	6	30	4
MESA				1	1	4	
FLAGSTAFF				1	2	3	
YUMA						1	1
SIERRA VISTA						1	
CHINLE						1	
PRESCOTT						*	
DISTRICT TOTAL	1	1	1	18	18	79	9

\*Staffed part-time by Flagstaff officer

**Abbreviated titles:**

CUSPO	=	Chief U.S. Probation Officer	SPEC	=	Senior U.S. Probation Officer
DCUSPO	=	Deputy Chief U.S. Probation Officer	USPO	=	U.S. Probation Officer
ADCUSPO	=	Assistant Deputy Chief Probation Officer	USPOA	=	U.S. Probation Officer Asst.
SUSPO	=	Supervisory U.S. Probation Officer			

### SUPPORT/MANAGER STAFFING

LOCATION	OP/ADM MGR	SUP V	DQ A	SEC TO CHIEF	AAPO	CLERK	RECP	REPRO CLERK
TUCSON		1	1	1	10	5	1	1
PHOENIX	1	1	1		8	4	1	1
MESA					1			
FLAGSTAFF					1			
YUMA					1			
SIERRA VISTA					1			
CHINLE								
PRESCOTT								
TOTAL	1	2	2	1	22	9	2	2

**Abbreviated titles:**

OP/ADM MGR	=	Operations/Administrative Manager	AAPO	=	Administrative Assistant to U.S.
SUPV	=	Probation Support Staff Supervisor			Probation Officer
DQA	=	Data Quality Analyst	RECEP	=	Receptionist
SEC TO CHIEF	=	Secretary to the Chief	REPRO CLERK	=	Reproduction and Copy Clerk

### ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES STAFFING

LOCATION	HUMAN RESOURCES	AUTOMATION	PROCUREMENT	FINANCIAL
PHOENIX	1.5	5	3	1
TUCSON	1	1		
TOTAL	2.5	6	3	1

## **PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATIONS**

During fiscal year 2000, officers completed 3,678 presentence reports throughout the district. This represented an increase of 510 reports over the number of presentence reports completed during the previous fiscal year. The nine percent increase over the previous fiscal year ended a double-digit growth pattern that began in fiscal year 1996. During fiscal years 1996 through 1999 our district experienced percentage increases of 21, 22, 37, and 30 in the number of presentence investigation reports completed.

Presentence reports were completed mainly by 42 officers assigned to presentence units, which were managed by eight presentence supervisors. Three supervisors and 15 officers were assigned to the Phoenix office, and five supervisors and 27 officers were assigned to the Tucson office. Five of the 42 officers in the presentence units were Sentencing and Guideline Specialists, who completed the more complex presentence investigations, provided training on sentencing matters and acted as a resource to officers, attorneys, and judges. At times, the workload demands outpaced the number of officers available to complete reports, so field supervision officers completed nearly 100 presentence reports. The fiscal year ended with a growth in the number of officers assigned to presentence units: 52 officers (seven of whom were Sentencing and Guideline Specialists) were managed by nine presentence supervisors. Four supervisors and 21 officers were assigned to the Phoenix office, and five supervisors and 31 officers were assigned to the Tucson office.

The growth in the number of officers in the presentence units was the result of the double-

digit percentage growth pattern we experienced in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. During fiscal year 2000 officers worked extra hours and throughout the year were committed and dedicated to ensure quality presentence investigations were available to the courts.

This district's proximity to the United States/Mexico border is one factor affecting the types of offenses seen by officers. Violations of immigration laws accounted for 53 percent of presentence investigation types and violations of drug laws accounted for 29 percent of investigation types. In combination, immigration and drug related convictions accounted for 82 percent of cases investigated. As part of presentence investigations, officers investigate the criminal history of every defendant facing sentencing. In rating the severity of defendants' criminal history, the Sentencing Guidelines assign Criminal History Categories in each case; Category I is the least severe and Category VI is the most severe. Defendants having criminal histories toward the least severe range (Categories I and II) accounted for 57 percent of all cases and defendants having criminal histories toward the most severe range (Categories V and VI) accounted for six percent of all cases.

## PRESENTENCE REPORTS

LOCATION	PSR	PPSI	POST	COLL	TOTAL
PHOENIX	1,382	0	0	786	2,168
TUCSON	2,188	10	3	395	2,596
MESA	28	0	3	1	32
FLAGSTAFF	46	0	53	5	104
YUMA	34	8	6	160	208
SIERRA VISTA	0	0	0	1	1
DISTRICT TOTAL	3,678	18	65	1,348	5,109

**Abbreviated Report Types:**

PSR	=	Presentence Report
PPSI	=	Petty Offense Presentence Report
POST	=	Post-Sentence Report
COLL	=	Collateral Investigation for Another District

## COMMUNITY SUPERVISION SERVICES

### *Offender Supervision*

The District of Arizona continued to experience an increase in the number of supervision cases. The previous year the number of offenders supervised reached a peak of 2,188, while in fiscal year 2000 the number of offenders supervised reached a peak of 2,423. The total number of offenders supervised fluctuates due to revocation proceedings, expiration of supervision, and offenders transferring in and out of the district. The monthly average number of cases under supervision was 2,343. Supervision officers prepared 1,347 collateral reports, 1,194 violation reports and 175 pre-release reports during fiscal year 2000.

With the requirement to supervise offenders in the community, supervision officers utilized traditional

hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.), weekends, holidays, and non-traditional hours, between 5:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. or before 8:00 a.m. to ensure offenders were in compliance with court ordered conditions. In addition to personal meetings with offenders, officers utilized a myriad of services and tools to monitor offenders. Government owned vehicles were available for field work, breathalyzers were assigned for on the spot alcohol analysis, digital cameras for photographs, and a variety of treatment agencies were used to ensure compliance with court ordered treatment conditions.

Supervision officers worked in conjunction with federal, state, county, city, and tribal law enforcement to monitor offenders in the community. Should any offenders come to the attention of these agencies, the assigned supervision officer was notified by an automated state system to which the Probation Office

entered data on a regular basis. These agencies also assisted by keeping officers abreast of criminal activity and safety issues in the communities they serve.

Senior officers supervised offenders with the more serious substance abuse and mental health histories along with sex offender cases. Fiscal year 2000, offenders having a special condition for drug treatment totaled 553, for alcohol treatment 121, and mental health treatment 393. The District of Arizona continued to supervise one of the larger sex offender populations. The senior officers are diverse in their knowledge, experience, and skills which allows them to provide guidance to other officers in their respective areas of expertise.

A committee was appointed to revise the office's drug and alcohol policy. The policy was developed with the assistance of supervisors, senior officers, and line staff. The policy was approved by management and was placed on the Probation web site. There are committees working to develop other policies and procedures which will also be added to the web site, once they are approved by management.

#### ***Community Supervision of Sex Offenders***

There were approximately 150 sex offenders on supervision in the District of Arizona during the year. This number varied depending on revocations and placements outside the district for treatment. The supervision of sex offenders continued to require significant resources and dedication from senior officers to deal with a variety of issues related to these cases. The majority of sex offender cases were supervised within Indian reservations. There was a trend toward more cases in the metropolitan areas with the prosecution of cases for internet sex related

crimes. The Probation Office continued to place a high emphasis on restorative justice for the victim, community and offender through the dedicated services of the officers who supervise these cases. The Probation Office continued to complete the Arizona Sex Offender Assessment Screening Profile for Regulatory Community Notification and entry into the state database maintained by the Arizona Department of Public Safety. As an additional duty, senior officers were charged with staying abreast of the federal and state statutes requiring community notification to ensure the Probation Office is in compliance with the law.

#### ***Administrative Caseload***

This caseload continued to be used for offenders who have demonstrated a significant period of compliance on supervision or pose minimal risk to the community. The offenders are required to submit a monthly supervision report by mail and can contact an officer telephonically for any special request. Often offenders will serve time on the Administrative Caseload prior to a recommendation for early termination from supervision. This caseload allows officers more time to see offenders who pose a greater risk to the community and are in need of closer supervision. One probation officer and two administrative assistants had oversight of this caseload which had approximately 249 offenders.

#### ***Inactive Cases***

The inactive caseload consisted of offenders who entered the United States illegally, who have served a sentence of incarceration, have a term of supervised release to follow, and were deported. Such offenders are given a special condition not

to illegally re-enter the United States. When outside the jurisdiction of the United States, these offenders cannot be supervised and are therefore placed on the inactive caseload. If such an offender is apprehended illegally re-entering the United States, a violation petition is filed and revocations proceedings are initiated. These petitions are filed by probation officer assistants and reviewed by a supervisor. Being a border district, this caseload will likely continue to grow. There were approximately 3,000 cases on this caseload during the year.

#### ***Supervision of Juvenile Offenders***

Because of their special needs, the 100 juvenile offenders being supervised by the Probation Office were typically assigned to one senior

officer who specialized in this area. This procedure was changed and juvenile offenders are now assigned to all senior officers. There were too many juveniles for one officer to effectively supervise because of the vast geographical area.

#### ***Collection of Financial Obligations***

The total for fines, restitution, and special assessments collected for fiscal year 2000 was \$2,758,686. To ensure officers are complying with offender payment schedules, at the six month case review, a record of payments is printed for officers and supervisors. This allows the supervisor and officer to determine if the offender is paying as ordered.

### **PERSONS UNDER ACTIVE SUPERVISION Snapshot as of 09/30/2000**

LOCATION	PROB	TSR	PAROLE	OTHER	TOTAL
PHOENIX	443	581	33	7	1,064
TUCSON	215	378	20	2	615
MESA	113	157	4	2	276
FLAGSTAFF	133	97	8	4	242
YUMA	29	50	1	1	81
SIERRA VISTA	66	71	1	7	145
DISTRICT TOTAL	999	1,334	67	23	2,423

**Abbreviated Supervision Types:**    PROB    =    Probation  
   TSR        =    Term of Supervised Release



### ***Treatment Services***

During Fiscal Year 2000, the Probation Office maintained 26 service agreements with 20 outpatient treatment providers throughout Arizona to help ensure access on demand to substance abuse, general mental health, and sex offender treatment. Services included substance abuse assessments, psychological/psychiatric evaluations and treatment (including access to psychotropic medication), sex offender evaluations and testing, collection of urine samples for drug testing, and individual and group substance abuse treatment, general mental health treatment, and sex offender treatment. Additionally, access to drug testing services was maintained through the Probation System's national contract with PharmChem Laboratories.

At any given time during the year, there were 703 offenders in treatment, representing 30% of the 2,343 monthly average of offenders on active supervision. Of the offenders in treatment, 552 were in substance abuse programs, 102 were in sex offender programs, and 49 were in general mental health programs.

Probation officers and treatment providers continued to utilize urinalysis testing as the primary method to detect and deter offender drug use. The monthly average of urine samples collected during the year was 2,016.

### ***Electronic Monitoring Services***

Electronic monitoring involves the use of an ankle bracelet and transmitter that emits a radio signal 24 hours per day to a field monitoring device (FMD) attached to the offender's home telephone line. Over the telephone line, the FMD alerts the "monitoring center" when the offender leaves and enters the home, or if the offender

tampers with the equipment. Whenever a problem is noted, the monitoring center immediately pages the probation officer, who may initiate follow up action.

Electronic monitoring services in the District of Arizona were provided under a national contract awarded by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to BI Monitoring, Boulder, Colorado. During the year, a total of 257 offenders served an average of 112 days on home confinement with electronic monitoring, at a cost of \$4.35 per day (October - March) and \$4.30 per day (April - September). Probation officers obtained partial payments for services from the offenders themselves whenever possible. The co-payment collection rate for Fiscal Year 2000 was 25 percent.

### **SUPPORT STAFF**

During the year, support staff for the district grew in both divisions. With staffing allocations available, four administrative assistants, two clerks, and a receptionist were hired. With those hires came the opportunity for in-house promotions. A Phoenix receptionist was promoted to clerk, and a Tucson clerk promoted to Calendar Administrative Assistant.

The Data Quality Analysts continued quarterly district reviews of the Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Tracking System (PACTS). This fiscal year a total of 1,035 cases were reviewed, which included the Inactive and Administrative caseloads. During the last quarter the standard for review was revised from 10 cases per officer to 5 in order to avoid duplication during quarterly reviews.

All new staff received training regarding PACTS. Officers were given PACTS viewing rights and access to the reports menu, and support staff were trained to enter data into supervision and investigation screens. A PACTS Refresher session informed staff that the district was beginning the transition to a new version of PACTS entitled PACTS-ECM. The Data Quality Analysts spent numerous hours conducting a major cleanup of data in PACTS, revising and correcting 173 pages of data. At the end of the year, the data cleanup effort continued.

Automation continued to be a big part of the Probation Office's ability to work smarter. A client list is generated for all active caseloads with essential information for officers. A PACTS program was created using the client list address field to produce mailing lists and labels. This program allowed staff to print letters and labels en masse when entire caseloads were being transferred from one officer to another. Another report developed to assist in dividing caseloads was the PACTS Zip Code Report. This report lists cases by zip code and includes PACTS numbers, names, addresses, and a total number of cases for each specific zip code, allowing case assignment to officers by geographic location.

The inactive and administrative cases, as well as our large number of drug and sex offenders, reflect the diversity of Arizona's caseloads. The district also supervised two unusual types of cases that required accounting clarification by the Administrative Office. The office supervised a few county probation cases on a "courtesy" basis because county authorities determined there was a legal conflict with the county probation office supervising the case. Federal officers supervised the cases, assisting with the collection of fines and restitution, with payments going directly to the

local court. Officers also supervised a few deferred supervision cases, a form of diversion.

Recognizing the importance of reporting case counts, the Data Quality Analysts continue to maintain high statistical accuracy in our data. The reports produced for staff establish an effective information system for the office. Staff keep abreast of new automation technology and provide assistance in creating reports from PACTS data for management.

## **TRAINING**

The shortfall of staff with increasing workload, remained a training challenge this fiscal year. It was difficult to schedule training programs for overworked staff members. However, various training programs necessary to maintain professional skills and development, continued to be offered to staff.

A team was formed in the district to establish a policy regarding how to handle a critical incident. Consequently, three officers were sent to Dallas, Texas, for specialized training. In order to assist in the inspection of officers weapons, an officer was sent to Oakland, California, to attend armory field school at Smith and Wesson. Two officers were sent to the Ruger armory field school in New Port, New Hampshire. Further, all firearms instructors participated in a one-day Firearm Training Simulator Training.

In order to become familiar with the duties of the U.S. Border Patrol, the Nogales Border Patrol Office arranged for 20 of our officers to ride along with agents during their patrol of the border. Additionally, the U.S. Customs office in Nogales, Arizona, gave a day long tour to 45 staff members.

A week-long orientation for new officers was conducted twice this fiscal year. The officers also spent a week in Washington, D.C., undergoing training with the Federal Judicial Center. Further orientation for new officers included participation in the district's Basic Officer Safety Academy and Firearms Orientation.

Due to the shortage of CPR/First Aid instructors in the district, two officers were trained to certify officers who carry firearms. Support staff also took advantage of the training and a total of 40 staff members were certified.

The leader of the district's Defensive Tactics Program, was sent to the Federal Law Enforcement Academy in Glynco, Georgia, for a two-week certification training for instructors. Eight officers were sent to a three-day training session presented by the Calibre Press Association, on street survival tactics.

The American Probation and Parole Association, (APPA) held their summer conference in St. Louis, Missouri. Four officers were sent to participate in various workshops on officer safety, cultural awareness, sentencing guidelines, verbal judo and hate crimes. The Four Corners Indian Conference, in Durango, Colorado, was attended by six officers who supervise the majority of the Indian Reservation cases in Arizona.

Two guideline specialists were sent to the Ninth Circuit Symposium in Orlando, Florida. The U.S. Sentencing Commission and other distinguished guideline experts sponsored the event. The training was designed for the experienced practitioner and focused on investigation and sentencing issues.

The district's Sex Offender Specialist was sent to a three-day seminar in Butner, North Carolina, regarding how to effectively manage sex offenders in the community from the perspective of the Bureau of Prisons. Further, two officers who supervise a majority of sex offenders, attended training in San Diego, California, sponsored by the National Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers.

In addition, a one-day training session conducted in both Phoenix and Tucson, was offered to increase proofreading and grammar skills. A total of 24 staff members attended.

The annual District Conference for staff focused on self-development. Various facilitators assisted in retirement planning, stress reduction, and planning an individualized fitness program.

## **STAFF SAFETY**

Staff safety remained a high priority for the Probation Office in fiscal year 2000. Officers participated in ongoing safety training designed to reinforce the importance of physical fitness, self defense and mental preparedness. The defensive tactics program continued to provide officers with advanced self defense training. The program focused on utilizing the body's natural reactions to defend oneself. Scenario based training continued to be utilized to allow participants to use acquired skills in a realistic setting.

Basic Officer Safety Academies were conducted throughout the year. This program is unique because the program was developed specifically for probation officers. The program consists of five days of intensive training which is both physically and psychologically demanding on participants. The singular goal of the program remains for officers to heighten their sense of safety while conducting their official duties. Class

size is limited to 18 to 20 participants in order to provide useful one on one, hands on instruction in a “safe to make mistakes” environment. Participants engage in live, situational scenarios that simulate potentially dangerous situations which officers could find themselves in the performance of their duties. The scenarios are video taped and participants, with guidance from instructors, gain insight into how they should react to potentially dangerous and traumatic events. Throughout the five days, participants become better prepared to effectively deal with stressful situations through the application of Probation Office policy, use of voice commands, self defense tactics and proper use of force. Live firearms training, automated firearms training and the use of oleoresin capsicum spray are also incorporated into the training. Participant feedback is a major part of the Basic Academy and suggestions are used to improve the program and provide future participants a worthwhile experience. Numerous officers commented this training, while demanding, was the most educational and realistic training they have attended. The experience officers gain during this training is then reinforced throughout the year during ongoing defensive tactics and firearms training.

## **FIREARMS PROGRAM**

The district’s firearms program, in conjunction with the defensive tactics program, continues to play an integral role in preparing officers to safely conduct their official duties. All aspects of the firearms program are geared toward providing officers with the necessary training to assess a potential life-threatening situation, and to take the appropriate steps to remove themselves from the threat. The district firearms instructor

and the eight assistant firearms instructors work together to provide the most effective and safest training possible. The year 2000 was another safe year with no reported injuries.

An additional 13 officers completed the initial three-day firearms course to obtain authorization to carry a firearm in the course of their duties. Additionally, three officers completed a two-day National Assistant Firearms Instructor course in June 2000, qualifying them to be assistant firearms instructors. Given the growth of the firearms program, their assistance is greatly needed. In addition to the district firearms instructor, six of the assistant instructors became certified F.A.T.S. (Firearms Training Simulation) instructors.

The program had over 80 officers who consistently attend the quarterly requalifications in Tucson and Phoenix. The qualifications include the Close Range Course, the Double Action Course; various scenario/judgment courses and an annual night/low-light course. In the judgment courses and Firearms Training Simulation (F.A.T.S.), the officers were exposed to threatening situations, simulating situations they might be confronted with in the street while conducting fieldwork, and they responded accordingly. The instructors provide immediate feedback. It is believed judgment courses and the F.A.T.S. instruction are the most effective way to prepare officers to survive a life-threatening situation.

The firearms program will continue to be run by a team of dedicated instructors who are involved in the program because they care about officer safety and believe they can make a difference.